

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

RICHARD KADREY, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

META PLATFORMS, INC., et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 23-cv-03417-VC (TSH)

DISCOVERY ORDER


Re: Dkt. No. 143

It is sometimes said that timing is everything. Well, it turns out that's true for bad timing as well. Plaintiffs request that the Court allow them to take 35 party depositions, exclusive of third-party depositions, or in the alternative they request a total of 180 hours of deposition testimony. And they made that request . . . 18 days before the current close of fact discovery. *See* ECF No. 143 (September 12, 2024 motion to extend deposition limits); ECF No. 87 (fact discovery closes September 30, 2024). If Plaintiffs had taken 30 depositions or 150 hours of deposition testimony to date, then this motion wouldn't be so bad because taking a few more depositions in the second half of September wouldn't be a problem. But since Plaintiffs have taken zero depositions, the 35 party depositions (plus non-party depositions), or alternatively the 180 hours of deposition testimony, would all have to occur in the second half of September, which is obviously impossible. Therefore, Plaintiffs' motion is **DENIED**.

Plaintiffs have a pending motion to extend the close of fact discovery, ECF No. 129, which Meta opposes, ECF No. 137, and which has not been ruled on. The Court will *sua sponte* reconsider this discovery order if the close of fact discovery changes. For present purposes, the Court denies Plaintiffs' motion because the requested relief is incompatible with the current case schedule.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: September 13, 2024


THOMAS S. HIXSON
United States Magistrate Judge